Appl. No. 09/599,812

REMARKS

In view of the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the subject application. This amendment is believed to be fully responsive to all issues raised in the February 5, 2004, Office action (hereinafter "the February 5th Office action").

Telephone Interview

The Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for conducting a telephone interview with the undersigned on January 13, 2004, to discuss the Office action of August 12, 2003. During the telephone interview the Applicants' positions with regard to the inapplicability of the Smale reference to various elements of the claims of the present application were discussed. More particularly, discussed in the telephone interview was Applicants' position that, contrary to the position set forth in the August 12, 2003 Office action, the "multiple attachment points" recited in a number of the claims were not equivalent to the "arrays 60-62" of the Smale reference. Also discussed in the telephone interview was Applicants' position that, contrary to the position set forth in the August 12, 2003 Office action, the "multiple extension managers" recited in a number of the claims were not equivalent to the "multiple data structures 52-54" of the Smale reference.

It is stated in the present Office action that "During the interview, it was agreed that Smale teaches that the arrays 60-62 stores the results of the filtering;

Appl. No. 09/599,812

and the notification manager 32 filters the data associated with the files that described software extensions and receives data from the arrays. However, there is only one notification manager 32." Applicants would like to point out that such an agreement was not reached. Rather, the undersigned indicated that the Office's position was clearly conveyed, not that the Office's position correct.

CLAIM AMENDMENTS

The preambles of each of claims 1-25 have been amended. The amendments to the preambles of claims 1-25 are not believed, or intended, to narrow the scope of the claims in any way. Rather, the amendments of claims 1-25 have been made improve their grammar and form. Other claim amendments are discussed below with respect to the particular rejected claims.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

Claims Rejected Under - 35 USC §102(b)

Claim 9 reads as follows:

9.   A computer-readable medium embodying a software architecture, the architecture comprising:

a hub structure configured to:

receive multiple different files that describe extensions that can be added to a software platform;

combine the multiple different files into a single exposable list; and

Appl. No. 09/599,812

expose the single exposable list to a filter structure comprising one or more attachment points configured to filter the list, each attachment point including logic for filtering.

In the February 5th Office action, the Office stated that the "multiple data structures 52-54 are interpreted as a filter structure comprising one or more attachment points." As such, it appears that each data structure (52, 53, and 54) of Smale is being equated by the Office to an attachment point in the present application

Claim 9 has been amended to recite each attachment point including logic for filtering. The multiple data structures 52-54 of Smale, which the Office has equated to the attachment points of the present invention, are simple data structures that store data. There is nothing in Smale that teaches or suggests that any of the data structures 52, 53, or, 54 includes logic for filtering, as recited in claim 9.

As described, Smale fails to teach or suggest multiple attachment points, each of which including logic for filtering, as recited in claim 9. As such, it is believed that claim 9 is allowable over the Smale patent, and such allowance is respectfully requested.

Claims 10 and 11 each depend in some form from claim 9. As such, each of claims 10 and 11 is necessarily allowable over the Smale patent by virtue of this

17

dependency. Each of claims 10 and 11 also specifies additional features that are not disclosed by either the Smale patent.

Claims Rejected Under - 35 USC §103(a)

Each of claims 1, 8, 18, 40, and 42 has been rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Smale in view of Donahue (USPN 6,199,204).

Claim 1 reads as follows:

1.   A computer-readable medium embodying a software architecture, the architecture comprising:

multiple attachment points collectively arranged to filter data associated with files that describe software extensions, each attachment point including logic for filtering data; and

multiple extension managers associated with the multiple attachment points and with respective feature types that can be added to a software platform by software extensions, the extension managers being configured to receive data from the multiple attachment points that pertains only to the feature type with which the extension manager is associated.

As noted above, in the February 5th Office action, the Office stated that the "multiple data structures 52-54 are interpreted as a filter structure comprising one or more attachment points." As such, it appears that each data structure (52, 53,

and 54) of Smale is being equated by the Office to an attachment point in the present application.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite <u>each attachment point including logic for filtering data</u>. As described above, there is nothing in Smale that teaches or suggests that any of the data structures 52, 53, or, 54, which the Office has equated to the attachment points of the present invention, includes logic for filtering data, as recited in claim 1. Furthermore, there is nothing in Donahue that teaches or suggests attachment points including logic for filtering data, or suggests that the data structures 52, 53, or 54 of Smale could be modified to include logic for filtering data, as recited in claim 1.

As described, neither Smale nor Donahue, alone or in combination, teach or suggest multiple attachment points, each of which including <u>logic for filtering data</u>, as recited in claim 1. As such, it is believed that claim 1 is allowable over the combination of Smale and Donahue, and such allowance is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-8 each depend in some form from claim 1. As such, each of claims 2-8 is necessarily allowable over the combination of Smale and Donahue by virtue of this dependency. Each of claims 2-8 also specifies additional features that are not disclosed by either Smale or Donahue, either alone or in combination.

Claim 18 reads as follows:

18.   A computer-readable medium embodying a software architecture, the architecture comprising

a hub structure configured to:

receive multiple different files that describe software extensions that can be added to a software platform;

combine the multiple different files into a single exposable list; and

expose the single exposable list to a filter structure that is configured to filter the list,

the filter structure comprising multiple attachment points collectively arranged to filter data associated with the list exposed by the hub structure, each attachment point including logic for filtering data; and

multiple extension managers associated with the multiple attachment points and with respective feature types that can be added to a software platform by software extensions, the extension managers being configured to receive data from the multiple attachment points that pertains only to the feature type with which the extension manager is associated.

As noted above, the Office stated that the "multiple data structures 52-54 are interpreted as a filter structure comprising one or more attachment points." As such, it appears that each data structure (52, 53, and 54) of Smale is being equated by the Office to an attachment point in the present application.

Claim 18 has been amended to recite each attachment point including logic for filtering data. As described above, there is nothing in Smale that teaches or suggests that any of the data structures 52, 53, or, 54, which the Office has equated

LEE A HAYES, PLLC   20   MSI-380US.M03

PAGE 22/30 * RCVD AT 5/3/2004 2:09:06 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/2 * DNIS:8729306 * CSID:3035390271 * DURATION (mm-ss):07-06

to the attachment points of the present invention, includes logic for filtering data, as recited in claim 18. Furthermore, there is nothing in Donahue that teaches attachment points 54 including logic for filtering data, or suggests that any of the data structures 52, 53, or, 54 of Smale could be modified to include logic for filtering data, as recited in claim 18.

As described, neither Smale nor Donahue, alone or in combination, teach or suggest multiple attachment points, each of which including logic for filtering data, as recited in claim 18. As such, it is believed that claim 18 is allowable over the combination of Smale and Donahue, and such allowance is respectfully requested.

Claims 19-25 each depend in some form from claim 18. As such, each of claims 19-25 is necessarily allowable over the combination of Smale and Donahue by virtue of this dependency. Each of claims 19-25 also specifies additional features that are not disclosed by either Smale or Donahue, either alone or in combination.

Claim 40 reads as follows:

40.   A method of providing a software extension comprising:

receiving multiple different files, each of which being associated with a different software extension and logically describing its associated software extension;

combining the multiple different files in a single list;

Appl. No. 09/599,812

exposing portions of the list;

processing exposed portions of the list using one or more attachment points to identify one or more feature types that are to be added to a software platform, at least one of the attachment points performing a logical operation; and

notifying an extension manager that is associated with a particular feature type.

As noted above, the Office stated that the "multiple data structures 52-54 are interpreted as a filter structure comprising one or more attachment points." As such, it appears that each data structure (52, 53, and 54) of Smale is being equated by the Office to an attachment point in the present application.

Claim 40 has been amended to recite processing exposed portions of the list using one or more attachment points and at least one of the each attachment points performing a logical operation. As described above, there is nothing in Smale that teaches or suggests that any of the data structures 52, 53, or, 54, which the Office has equated to the attachment points of the present invention, performs a logical operation. Rather, the data structures 52, 53, or, 54 simply store data. Furthermore, there is nothing in Donahue that teaches or suggests attachment points that perform a logical operation, or that any of the data structures 52, 53, or, 54 of Smale could be modified to perform a logical operation, as recited in claim 40.

As described, neither Smale nor Donahue, either alone or in combination, teach or suggest multiple attachment points, at least one of with performs a logical

Appl. No. 09/599,812

operation as recited in claim 40. As such, it is believed that claim 40 is allowable over the combination of Smale and Donahue, and such allowance is respectfully requested.

Claims 41 and 42 each depend in some form from claim 40. As such, each of claims 41 and 42 is necessarily allowable over the combination of Smale and Donahue by virtue of this dependency. Each of claims 41 and 42 also specifies additional features that are not disclosed by either Smale or Donahue, either alone or in combination.

Each of claims 10, 12-17, and 26-39 has been rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Smale in view of Cheng (USPN 6,421,656).

Claim 12 reads as follows:

12.   A software architecture embodied on a computer-readable medium, the architecture comprising multiple different attachment points each of which includes logic making the attachment point operable to:

receive XML data that pertains to one or more software extensions that can be added to a software platform;

process the XML data to provide a list of XML nodes; and

expose the list of XML nodes.

Appl. No. 09/599,812

As noted above, the Office stated that the "multiple data structures 52-54 are interpreted as a filter structure comprising one or more attachment points." As such, it appears that each data structure (52, 53, and 54) of Smale is being equated by the Office to an attachment point in the present application.

Claim 12 has been amended to recite that each attachment point includes logic making the attachment point operable to receive XML data that pertains to one or more software extensions that can be added to a software platform, process the XML data to provide a list of XML nodes, and expose the list of XML nodes.

As described above, there is nothing in Smale that teaches or suggests that any of the data structures 52, 53, or, 54, which the Office has equated to the attachment points of the present invention, includes any kind of logic. Rather, the data structures 52, 53, or, 54 simply store data. Furthermore, there is nothing in Cheng that teaches or suggests attachment points including logic for carrying out the steps recited in claim 12, or that any of the data structures 52, 53, or, 54 of Smale could be modified to include such logic.

As described, neither Smale nor Cheng, either alone or in combination, teach or suggest multiple attachment points, at least one of with performs a logical operation as recited in claim 12. As such, it is believed that claim 12 is allowable over the combination of Smale and Donahue, and such allowance is respectfully requested.

Claims 13-17 each depend in some form from claim 12. As such, each of claims 13-17 is necessarily allowable over the combination of Smale and Cheng

24

Appl. No. 09/599,812

by virtue of this dependency. Each of claims 13-17 also specifies additional features that are not disclosed by either Smale or Cheng, either alone or in combination.

Claim 26 reads as follows:

26.   A method of providing a software extension comprising:

exposing an XML list that contains one or more nodes;

processing the XML list with a structure including multiple attachment points_to identify specific nodes that correspond to various feature types that can be added to a software platform, at least one of the attachment points including processing logic; and

notifying an extension manager that is associated with at least one feature type if a node that corresponds to that feature type is identified in the XML list.

As noted above, the Office stated that the "multiple data structures 52-54 are interpreted as a filter structure comprising one or more attachment points." As such, it appears that each data structure (52, 53, and 54) of Smale is being equated by the Office to an attachment point in the present application.

Claim 26 has been amended to recite processing the XML list <u>with a structure including multiple attachment point, at least one of the attachment points including processing logic</u>. As described above, there is nothing in Smale that teaches or suggests that any of the data structures 52, 53, or, 54, which the Office

LEE & HAYES, PLLC   25   MSI-586US.M03

PAGE 27/30 * RCVD AT 5/3/2004 2:09:06 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/2 * DNIS:8729306 * CSID:3035390271 * DURATION (mm-ss):07-06

has equated to the attachment points of the present invention, include any kind of logic. Rather, the data structures 52, 53, or, 54 of Smale simply store data. Furthermore, there is nothing in Cheng that teaches or suggests a structure including multiple attachment point, at least one of the attachment points including processing logic, or that any of the data structures 52, 53, or, 54 of Smale could be modified to include processing logic, as recited in claim 26.

As described, neither Smale nor Cheng, either alone or in combination, teach or suggest a structure including multiple attachment point, at least one of the attachment points including processing logic, as recited in claim 26. As such, it is believed that claim 26 is allowable over the combination of Smale and Donahue, and such allowance is respectfully requested.

Claims 26-32 each depend in some form from claim 26. As such, each of claims 26-32 is necessarily allowable over the combination of Smale and Cheng by virtue of this dependency. Each of claims 26-32 also specifies additional features that are not disclosed by either Smale or Cheng, either alone or in combination.

Claim 33 reads as follows:

33.   A method of providing a software extension comprising:

receiving XML data that pertains to a software extension that is to be added to a software platform;

Appl. No. 09/599,812

processing the XML data using one or more attachment points to identify

XML nodes, at least one of the attachment points including logic; and

exposing an XML list that contains one or more nodes that are identified by

said processing.

As noted above, the Office stated that the "multiple data structures 52-54

are interpreted as a filter structure comprising one or more attachment points." As

such, it appears that each data structure (52, 53, and 54) of Smale is being equated

by the Office to an attachment point in the present application.

Claim 33 has been amended to recite at least one of the attachment points

including logic. As described above, there is nothing in Smale that teaches or

suggests that any of the data structures 52, 53, or, 54, which the Office has equated

to the attachment points of the present invention, include any kind of logic. Rather,

the data structures 52, 53, or, 54 of Smale simply store data. Furthermore, there is

nothing in Cheng that teaches or suggests attachment points including logic, or

that any of the data structures 52, 53, or, 54 of Smale could be modified to include

logic.

As described, neither Smale nor Cheng, either alone or in combination,

teach or suggest processing the XML data using one or more attachment points to

identify XML nodes, at least one of the attachment points including logic, as

recited in claim 33. As such, it is believed that claim 33 is allowable over the

combination of Smale and Donahue, and such allowance is respectfully requested.

LEE & HAYES, PLLC   27   MSI-586US.M03

PAGE 29/30 * RCVD AT 5/3/2004 2:09:06 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/2 * DNIS:8729306 * CSID:3035390271 * DURATION (mm-ss):07-06

Appl. No. 09/599,812

Claims 34-39 each depend in some form from claim 33. As such, each of claims 34-39 is necessarily allowable over the combination of Smale and Cheng by virtue of this dependency. Each of claims 34-39 also specifies additional features that are not disclosed by either Smale or Cheng, either alone or in combination.

New claims 43-45 have been added. Each of these claims is believed to be novel and non-obvious over the aforementioned Smale, Cheng, and Donahue references and any combination of these references.

Conclusion

Claims 1-45 are in believed to be in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the present application. Should any issues remain that prevent immediate issuance of the application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney to discuss the unresolved issue.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 5/3/04

By: _____
Steven J. Spellman
Reg. No. 45,124
(303) 539-0265 x239

Lee & Hayes, PLLC   28   MSI-586US.M03